

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/805,841	DUERK ET AL.
	Examiner Tiffany A. Fetzner	Art Unit 2859

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Scott Oldham Reg. No. 32,712. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2005

Time: 12:30pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Examiner amendments to claims 1-26 to ensure that the novelty of the invention was clearly set forth in independent claims 1, 24 and that all of the remaining dependent claims had proper antecedence based on the amended independent claims.

Prior art documents discussed:

The non-patent articles such as Nayak, et al., article which teach spiral imaging, but not chemical species suppression to correct off resonance B0 inhomogeneity, and do not use at least two-point Dixon Processing.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because the features argued by applicant for novelty, (i.e. spiral data acquisition, for at least two point Dixon processing, the fact that the spiral acquisition with at least two-point Dixon processing allows corrections of off-resonance effects resulting from B0 inhomogeneity in reconstructed resulting images, was not clearly set forth in the claims of the May 4th 2005 amendment and response. The examiner noted that applicant had fil support in the original specification for applicant's argued position, but no clear recitation of the argued combination in the actual claims. Applicant agreed to have the examiner perform an examiner's amendment to the pending claims, to ensure that the originally disclosed and argued features of the independent claims were clearly recited, and that proper antecedence and formal matters were appropriately corrected in any dependent claims, resulting from the amended corrections. The examiner was thanked for her time in placing the application in condition for allowance. The applicant was informed that a new set of formal drawings would now be required because the official draftsperson, objected to the corrected Formal drawings submitted May 4th 2005.